arXiv:1409.7997v2 [hep-ex] 20 Aug 2015

Study of CP violation in flavor tagged and untagged $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays

E. Won[a], B. R. Ko[a,1,*], B. Golob[b,c]

[a] *Korea University, Seoul 02841*
[b] *Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, 1000 Ljubljana*
[c] *J. Stefan Institute, 1000 Ljubljana*

Abstract

We review CP-violating observables in flavor tagged and untagged $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays and evaluate the CP asymmetry difference between the two decays. We note that this commonly neglected difference is not zero in principle and can be significant in future B factory experiments. We also construct an expression to extract the strong phase difference between $\bar{D}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ and $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays, independently of existing experimental methods.

Keywords: CP asymmetry, flavor tagged, flavor untagged, strong phase
PACS: 11.30.Er, 12.15.Ff, 13.25.Ft, 14.40.Lb

The violation of combined charge conjugation and parity (CP) symmetry in the quark sector through the weak interaction was predicted by the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mechanism [1, 2] and has been experimentally observed in K- and B-meson systems [3]. On the other hand, CP violation (CPV) in charm meson system has not been observed yet and is expected to be small within the standard model (SM) [4]. Therefore, search for CPV in charm meson system naturally provides a window for new physics beyond the SM.

Recent experimental CP asymmetry measurements [5–13] in charm meson decays adapted $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ [2] (referred to as "untagged") and $D^{*+} \to D^0(\to K^-\pi^+)\pi^+_{\rm soft}$ (referred to as "tagged" and $\pi^+_{\rm soft}$ refers to a relatively low momentum charged pion) decays as control samples to correct for asymmetries due to different reconstruction efficiencies between positively and negatively charged tracks.

According to Ref. [14], untagged $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ reveals CP asymmetry resulting from the interference between the decays with and without D^0-$\bar{D}^0$ mixing

*Corresponding author
Email address: brko@ibs.re.kr (B. R. Ko)
[1] Now at Center for Axion and Precision Physics Research, Institute for Basic Science (IBS), Daejeon 34141
[2] Throughout this paper, the inclusion of the charge-conjugate decay mode is implied unless otherwise stated.

even without direct CPV, namely $A_{CP}^{\rm untag} = -\sqrt{R_D} y \sin\delta \sin\phi$, which has been considered in Refs. [5–8].[3] Other measurements [9–13] used both tagged and untagged decays with the common assumption that the difference in CP asymmetries between the two decays is zero.

Also, one of the obstacles in interpreting the experimental D^0-$\bar{D}^0$ mixing measurements in the decay $\bar{D}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ is the appearance of the phase difference between $\bar{D}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ and $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays due to the strong interaction. A direct experimental way to extract this strong phase difference has been utilizing a quantum-coherent production of $D^0\bar{D}^0$ pairs from $\psi(3770)$ and their measurements of the strong phase difference are $\cos\delta = 1.15^{+0.19+0.00}_{-0.17-0.08}$, $\sin\delta = 0.56^{+0.32+0.21}_{-0.31-0.20}$, $\delta = (18^{+11}_{-19})^\circ$ [15] and $\cos\delta = 1.02\pm0.11\pm0.06\pm0.01$ [16]. Further precise measurements are highly desired for interpretation of the recent experimental observations of D^0-$\bar{D}^0$ mixing in the decay $\bar{D}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ [17–19].

In this paper, we review CPV in flavor tagged and untagged $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays, testing the validity of the systematic consideration of CPV in the untagged decays adopted in Refs. [5–8] and the aforementioned assumption in CPV difference between the two decays adopted in Refs. [9–13] within the two CPV scenarios in D^0 meson system, "CPV-allowed" and "No direct CPV in DCS (doubly Cabibbo-suppressed) decays" [20]. We also propose a method to extract the strong phase difference between $\bar{D}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ and $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays.

The time evolution of the D^0-$\bar{D}^0$ system can be described by the Schrödinger equation [3]

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\begin{pmatrix} D^0(t) \\ \bar{D}^0(t) \end{pmatrix} = \left(\mathbf{M} - \frac{i}{2}\mathbf{\Gamma}\right)\begin{pmatrix} D^0(t) \\ \bar{D}^0(t) \end{pmatrix} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ are Hermitian matrices associating with the transitions, $D^0 \to D^0$ and $D^0 \to \bar{D}^0$. Our mass ($|D_{1,2}\rangle$) and flavor ($|D^0\rangle, |\bar{D}^0\rangle$) eigenstates of neutral D mesons are expressed as [20]

$$|D_{1,2}\rangle = p|D^0\rangle \mp q|\bar{D}^0\rangle \tag{2}$$

where p and q are complex numbers with the convention $CP|D^0\rangle = -|\bar{D}^0\rangle$ and $CP|\bar{D}^0\rangle = -|D^0\rangle$ under CP conservation. Note that we adopt the convention used in Ref. [20]. The time evolution of the mass eigenstate is given by $|D_i(t)\rangle = e^{-im_i t - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_i t}|D_i\rangle$, ($i$=1,2) where m_i and Γ_i are the mass and width of $|D_i\rangle$. From these, one usually defines mixing parameters $x \equiv (m_1 - m_2)/\Gamma = \Delta m/\Gamma$ and $y \equiv (\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2)/2\Gamma = \Delta\Gamma/2\Gamma$ where $\Gamma \equiv (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2)/2$, in order to describe the time evolution of the D meson system and CP asymmetries conveniently.

For the study of $D^0 \to f$ decay, one defines decay amplitude of an initially produced $D^0/\bar{D}^0$ into the final state $f/\bar{f}$ to be $\mathcal{A}_f/\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\bar{f}}$ for Cabibbo-favored (CF) decays and $\mathcal{A}_{\bar{f}}/\bar{\mathcal{A}}_f$ for DCS decays, respectively, where $f/\bar{f}$ stands for

[3] Ref. [7] used untagged $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$ decays as a control sample , thus the consideration was modified with relevant R_D [3] and $\delta_{K\pi\pi}$ [20].

$K^-\pi^+/K^+\pi^-$ final state. Then, under direct CP conservation in CF decays, $|\mathcal{A}_f|^2 = |\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\bar{f}}|^2$, we can define

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{q}{p}\frac{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_f}{\mathcal{A}_f} &\equiv \sqrt{R_D(1-A_D)}R_M e^{-i(\delta-\phi)}, \\ \frac{p}{q}\frac{\mathcal{A}_{\bar{f}}}{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\bar{f}}} &\equiv \sqrt{R_D(1+A_D)}R_M^{-1} e^{-i(\delta+\phi)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where R_D is the ratio of DCS to CF decay rates, $R_D = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{\bar{f}}|^2+|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_f|^2}{|\mathcal{A}_f|^2+|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\bar{f}}|^2}$, A_D is the direct CPV in DCS decays, $A_D = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{\bar{f}}|^2-|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_f|^2}{|\mathcal{A}_{\bar{f}}|^2+|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_f|^2}$, and δ is CP conserving strong phase difference between DCS and CF decay amplitudes. R_M and ϕ are the magnitude and argument of q/p,[4] where $R_M \neq 1$ indicates CPV in the mixing and $\phi \neq 0$ (nor $\phi \neq \pi$) implies that in the interference of the mixing and decay. Hence, the relations shown in Eq. (3) satisfy the condition "CPV-allowed" in Ref. [20]. With the relations given in Eq. (3), we have the expressions of the decay rates up to the second order in the mixing parameters, assuming the mixing parameters are small ($|x| \ll 1$ and $|y| \ll 1$), to be

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma(D^0(t)\to f) = e^{-\Gamma t}|\mathcal{A}_f|^2[1 \\ + \;& \Gamma t\sqrt{R_D(1-A_D)}R_M\{y\cos(\delta-\phi)+x\sin(\delta-\phi)\} \\ + \;& \Gamma^2t^2\frac{1}{4}R_D(1-A_D)R_M^2(x^2+y^2)], \\ & \Gamma(\bar{D}^0(t)\to \bar{f}) = e^{-\Gamma t}|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\bar{f}}|^2[1 \\ + \;& \Gamma t\sqrt{R_D(1+A_D)}R_M^{-1}\{y\cos(\delta+\phi)+x\sin(\delta+\phi)\} \\ + \;& \Gamma^2t^2\frac{1}{4}R_D(1+A_D)R_M^{-2}(x^2+y^2)], \\ & \Gamma(D^0(t)\to \bar{f}) = e^{-\Gamma t}|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\bar{f}}|^2[R_D(1+A_D) \\ + \;& \Gamma t\sqrt{R_D(1+A_D)}R_M\{y\cos(\delta+\phi)-x\sin(\delta+\phi)\} \\ + \;& \Gamma^2t^2\frac{1}{4}R_M^2(x^2+y^2)], \\ & \Gamma(\bar{D}^0(t)\to f) = e^{-\Gamma t}|\mathcal{A}_f|^2[R_D(1-A_D) \\ + \;& \Gamma t\sqrt{R_D(1-A_D)}R_M^{-1}\{y\cos(\delta-\phi)-x\sin(\delta-\phi)\} \\ + \;& \Gamma^2t^2\frac{1}{4}R_M^{-2}(x^2+y^2)], \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

and they are our fundamental relations in the construction of various CP asymmetries described below.

[4] In general, ϕ includes the weak phase arising from the corresponding complex elements of the CKM matrix. In charm meson decays these are, however, to a very good approximation real.

The final state of the untagged decay is the sum of the CF decay $D^0 \to f$, the DCS decay $\bar{D}^0 \to f$, the DCS decay following D^0-$\bar{D}^0$ mixing $D^0 \to \bar{D}^0 \to f$, and the CF decay following D^0-$\bar{D}^0$ mixing $\bar{D}^0 \to D^0 \to f$. Thus, the time-integrated decay rates for the untagged case are

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_f^{\rm untag} &= \int_0^\infty dt \left(\Gamma(D^0(t) \to f) + \Gamma(\bar{D}^0(t) \to f) \right), \\ \bar{\Gamma}_{\bar{f}}^{\rm untag} &= \int_0^\infty dt \left(\Gamma(\bar{D}^0(t) \to \bar{f}) + \Gamma(D^0(t) \to \bar{f}) \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The CP asymmetry in this case is defined as

$$A_{CP}^{\rm untag} \equiv \frac{\Gamma_f^{\rm untag} - \bar{\Gamma}_{\bar{f}}^{\rm untag}}{\Gamma_f^{\rm untag} + \bar{\Gamma}_{\bar{f}}^{\rm untag}}. \tag{6}$$

Note that our definition of $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ has an opposite sign of the one in Ref. [14]. The expression for $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ can be evaluated using all the relations given in Eq. (4) :

$$\begin{aligned} A_{CP}^{\rm untag} = &+ 2\sqrt{R_D} y \sin\delta \sin\phi \\ &- 2\sqrt{R_D}(1 - R_M) x \sin\delta \cos\phi \\ &- R_D A_D \\ &- \sqrt{R_D} A_D y \cos\delta \cos\phi \\ &+ (1 - R_M)(x^2 + y^2) \\ &- R_D (1 - R_M)(x^2 + y^2) \\ &- \frac{1}{2} R_D A_D (x^2 + y^2), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the factor 2 of the first term is not present and other terms are neglected in Ref. [14]. Using the world average CPV and mixing parameters from HFAG [21], $A_{CP}^{\rm untag} = (+1.27 \pm 3.83) \times 10^{-5}$, thus the magnitude of $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ can be at most 8.79×10^{-5} at 95% confidence level (CL) for the scenario "CPV-allowed". The magnitude of $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ can be neglected for the current experimental sensitivities [5–8], for example $A_{CP}^{D^+ \to K_S^0 \pi^+} = (-0.363 \pm 0.094 \pm 0.063 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.016) \times 10^{-2}$ [7], where the first uncertainty is statistical, the second is systematic mostly from the usage of the control samples, the third is systematic due to possible CPV in the control sample based on Ref. [14], and the fourth is irreducible systematic due to K_L^0-K_S^0 regeneration [22]. The sensitivity of $A_{CP}^{D^+ \to K_S^0 \pi^+}$ at the super-B factory currently under construction [23], however, is expected to be $(1.3 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.9 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-4}$, where the third is systematic due to possible CPV in the control sample given in this paper and others are the same as above. The CPV in the untagged decays will thus become a significant systematic source in the future CP asymmetry measurements. Assuming direct CP conservation $A_D = 0$, the relation $1 - R_M = (y/x) \tan\phi$ holds, which not

only associates CPV and mixing parameters, but also relates CPV in mixing and interference [24–26]. Within the SM and also for the case "No direct CPV in DCS decays", $\cos\phi \cong 1$ is a good approximation in charm meson system. Hereafter the approximation is to be applied for "No direct CPV in DCS decays". We note that the first and second terms in Eq. (7) cancel out each other under direct CP conservation, then CP asymmetry in the decays is expressed as

$$A_{CP}^{\rm untag} = \frac{y(x^2+y^2)\sin\phi}{x} \ {}^{5} \tag{8}$$

which is free from the strong interaction. Using the world average CPV and mixing parameters from HFAG [21], $A_{CP}^{\rm untag} = (-3.98 \pm 7.95) \times 10^{-7}$, hence the magnitude of $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ can be at most 1.96×10^{-6} at 95% CL for the scenario "No direct CPV in DCS decays". We also find $A_{CP}^{\rm untag} = 0$ with limiting the relations given in Eq. (4) up to the first order in x and y, which indicates indirect CPV in charm decays is approximately universal [27].

For the tagged analysis, the decay $D^{*+} \to D^0(\to f)\pi^+_{\rm soft}$ is the sum of the CF decay $D^0 \to f$ and the DCS decay following D^0-$\bar{D}^0$ mixing $D^0 \to \bar{D}^0 \to f$. The time-integrated decay rates for the tagged decays are

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_f^{\rm tag} &= \int_0^\infty dt\ \Gamma(D^0(t) \to f), \\ \bar{\Gamma}_{\bar{f}}^{\rm tag} &= \int_0^\infty dt\ \Gamma(\bar{D}^0(t) \to \bar{f}). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The CP asymmetry in the tagged decays is defined as

$$A_{CP}^{\rm tag} \equiv \frac{\Gamma_f^{\rm tag} - \bar{\Gamma}_{\bar{f}}^{\rm tag}}{\Gamma_f^{\rm tag} + \bar{\Gamma}_{\bar{f}}^{\rm tag}} \tag{10}$$

and evaluated using the first and second relations given in Eq. (4) :

$$\begin{aligned} A_{CP}^{\rm tag} = \ & + \ \sqrt{R_D}(y\sin\delta - x\cos\delta)\sin\phi \\ & - \ \sqrt{R_D}(1-R_M)(y\cos\delta + x\sin\delta)\cos\phi \\ & - \ \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{R_D}A_D(y\cos\delta + x\sin\delta)\cos\phi \\ & - \ R_D(1-R_M)(x^2+y^2) \\ & - \ \frac{1}{2}R_D A_D(x^2+y^2). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Using the world average CPV and mixing parameters from HFAG [21], $A_{CP}^{\rm tag} = (+0.29 \pm 2.83) \times 10^{-5}$, hence the magnitude of $A_{CP}^{\rm tag}$ can be at most 5.85×10^{-5}

[5] A small additional term $-\frac{R_D y(x^2+y^2)\sin\phi}{x}$ is omitted.

at 95% CL for the scenario "CPV-allowed". Under direct CP conservation, the asymmetry in the decays can be expressed as

$$A_{CP}^{\rm tag} = -\frac{\sqrt{R_D}(x^2+y^2)\cos\delta\sin\phi}{x},^{6} \tag{12}$$

where this can be found in Ref. [26]. Using the world average CPV and mixing parameters from HFAG [21], $A_{CP}^{\rm tag} = (+3.91 \pm 7.77) \times 10^{-6}$, thus the magnitude of $A_{CP}^{\rm tag}$ can be at most 1.91×10^{-5} at 95% CL for the scenario "No direct CPV in DCS decays".

Having compared Eq. (7) with Eq. (11) and Eq. (8) with (12), in general $A_{CP}^{\rm tag} \neq A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ and the differences between them ΔA_{CP} are $(-0.98 \pm 2.20) \times 10^{-5}$ for the "CPV-allowed" and $(+4.31 \pm 8.57) \times 10^{-6}$ for the "No direct CPV in DCS decays", respectively. Table 1 summarizes CP-violating observables and their magnitudes from this work. Thus, the magnitudes of ΔA_{CP} can be

Table 1: Summary of CP-violating observables and their magnitudes.

	"CPV-allowed"	"No direct CPV in DCS decays"
$A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$	$(+1.27 \pm 3.83) \times 10^{-5}$	$(-3.98 \pm 7.95) \times 10^{-7}$
$A_{CP}^{\rm tag}$	$(+0.29 \pm 2.83) \times 10^{-5}$	$(+3.91 \pm 7.77) \times 10^{-6}$
ΔA_{CP}	$(-0.98 \pm 2.20) \times 10^{-5}$	$(+4.31 \pm 8.57) \times 10^{-6}$

at most $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ and $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$ at 95% CL for the "CPV-allowed" and "No direct CPV in DCS decays", respectively. The upper limit of ΔA_{CP}, $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ can be neglected for the current experimental sensitivities [9–13], for example $A_{CP}^{D^0 \to K^+K^-} = (-0.32 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-2}$ [13], where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic. The sensitivity of $A_{CP}^{D^0 \to K^+K^-}$ at the super-B factory [23], however, is expected to be 3×10^{-4} (statistical) and 1×10^{-4} (systematic). The CPV difference between the tagged and untagged decays will thus become a significant systematic source in the future CP asymmetry measurements.

For "No direct CPV in DCS decays", the strong phase difference between $\bar{D}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ and $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays can be obtained by taking the ratio of $A_{CP}^{\rm tag}$ to $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$. The relation is

$$\cos\delta = -\frac{y}{\sqrt{R_D}}\left(\frac{A_{CP}^{\rm tag}}{A_{CP}^{\rm untag}}\right), \tag{13}$$

where the strong phase can be expressed in terms of y, $\sqrt{R_D}$, and CP asymmetries only. From this equation, one can extract the strong phase in an independent way by measuring the ratio of $A_{CP}^{\rm tag}$ to $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ experimentally. For the

[6] A small additional term $-\frac{R_D y(x^2+y^2)\sin\phi}{x}$ is omitted.

evaluation of the expected sensitivity on δ (σ_δ), we assign 0.007 and 0.01 for the uncertainties on $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ and $A_{CP}^{\rm tag}$ measurements, respectively, where the former is from the current best measurement [28] and the latter from our conservative assumption reflecting a conservative experimental uncertainty. We evaluate σ_δ as a function of $|A_{CP}^{\rm tag}/A_{CP}^{\rm untag}|$ by incorporating errors on $A_{CP}^{\rm tag}$, $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ given above, y, and R_D and the correlation between y and R_D from Ref. [21]. Figure 1 shows our evaluation implying that the sensitivity on δ using the method introduced in this paper would be better than that of current measurements [15, 16] depending on $|A_{CP}^{\rm tag}/A_{CP}^{\rm untag}|$. Furthermore, our evaluation shows σ_δ dominates from current sensitivities of y and R_D. Regardless of the sensitivity on δ, it is important to have an independent tool as a cross check on existing methods.



Figure 1: The solid (red) and dashed (blue) lines show the expected sensitivity on δ in degrees as a function of $|A_{CP}^{\rm tag}/A_{CP}^{\rm untag}|$ with and without experimental errors on $A_{CP}^{\rm tag}$ and $A_{CP}^{\rm untag}$ measurements. The dotted (black) line is the current best measurement from Ref. [16].

To conclude, we have reviewed CP asymmetries in flavor tagged and untagged $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays, CP asymmetry in the untagged decays and CP asymmetry difference between the two decays. Both CP-violating observables can be ignored for the current experimental sensitivities [5–13], but cannot be neglected in the future super-B factory experiments. However, improving CPV and mixing parameters at the future experiments helps to reduce the systematic uncertainty in the future CP asymmetry measurements. We also constructed an expression for the strong phase difference in terms of y, R_D, and CP asymmetries. This provides experimental access to the strong phase from measurements of CP asymmetries in flavor tagged and untagged $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays, which is independent of existing methods [15, 16].

We thank Anze Zupanc for comments on the manuscript and Alan Schwartz for providing us with the HFAG output correlations for $A_D = 0$. B. R. Ko is supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded

by the Korea government (MSIP) (No. NRF-2014R1A2A2A01005286) and E. Won is supported by No. NRF-2010-0021174.

1. Appendix

CP asymmetry in flavor tagged $D^0 \to \bar{f}$ decays (referred to as "wrong sign (WS)" decays) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{CP}^{\mathrm{tag,WS}} = & - \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_D}}(y\sin\delta + x\cos\delta)\sin\phi \\ & - \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_D}}(1-R_M)(y\cos\delta - x\sin\delta)\cos\phi \\ & + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{R_D}}A_D(y\cos\delta - x\sin\delta)\cos\phi \\ & - \frac{1}{R_D}(1-R_M)(x^2+y^2) \\ & + A_D \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

using the third and fourth relations in Eq. (4). Under direct CP conservation, the asymmetry is

$$\begin{aligned} A_{CP}^{\mathrm{tag,WS}} = & - \frac{(x^2+y^2)\cos\delta\sin\phi}{\sqrt{R_D}x} \\ & - \frac{y(x^2+y^2)\sin\phi}{R_D x}. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Then, A_{CP}^{untag} in Eq. (8) can be also obtained from Eqs. (12) and (15) because Eq. (6) can be also expressed as $A_{CP}^{\mathrm{untag}} = A_{CP}^{\mathrm{tag}} - R_D A_{CP}^{\mathrm{tag,WS}}$. By limiting the relations given in Eq. (4) up to the first order in the mixing parameters, one can get $A_{CP}^{\mathrm{tag}} = R_D A_{CP}^{\mathrm{tag,WS}}$ with Eqs. (12) and (15) [26], thus $A_{CP}^{\mathrm{untag}} = 0$ reflecting universality of indirect CPV in charm decays in approximation.

References

[1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963).

[2] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys., **49**, 652 (1973).

[3] J. Beringer *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).

[4] G. Burdman and I. Shipsey, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **53**, 431 (2003).

[5] B. R. Ko *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 181602 (2010).

[6] M. Starič *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 071801 (2012).

[7] B. R. Ko *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 021601 (2012), Erratum-ibid. **109**, 119903 (2012).

[8] B. R. Ko *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), J. High Energy Phys. 02 (**2013**) 098.

[9] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 061803 (2008).

[10] M. Starič *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **670**, 190 (2008).

[11] B. R. Ko *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 211801 (2011).

[12] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **85**, 012009 (2012).

[13] B. R. Ko *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), `arXiv:1011.0352`.

[14] A. A. Petrov, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 111901 (2004).

[15] D. M. Asner *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **86**, 112001 (2012).

[16] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BES III Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **734**, 227 (2014).

[17] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 101802 (2013).

[18] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 231802 (2013).

[19] B. R. Ko *et al.* (Belle collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 111801 (2014).

[20] Y. Amhis *et al.* (Heavy Flavor Averaging Group), `arXiv:1207.1158[hep-ex]` and online update at `http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/`.

[21] `http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/charm/FPCP14/results_mix+cpv.html`.

[22] B. R. Ko, E. Won, B. Golob, and P. Pakhlov, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 111501(R) (2011).

[23] T. Abe *et al.*, `arXiv:1011.0352`.

[24] M. Ciuchini *et al.* Phys. Lett. B **655**, 162 (2007).

[25] Y. Grossman, Y. Nir, and G. Perez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 071602 (2009).

[26] A. L. Kagan and M. D. Sokoloff, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 076008 (2009).

[27] Y. Grossman, A. L. Kagan, and Y. Nir, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 036008 (2007).

[28] G. Bonvicini *et al.*, (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **89**, 072002 (2014).